UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

ROBERT ROYBAL,

Plaintiff,

v.

TOPPENISH SCHOOL DISTRICT and JOHN CERNA,

Defendants.

No. 1:CV-14-3092-SMJ

ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED
ANSWER AND STRIKING
SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION

Before the Court, without oral argument, are Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Amended Answer, ECF No. 27, and Notice Striking Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 26. Defendants seek to file an amended answer and strike their previously-filed summary judgment motion, ECF No. 5. Having reviewed the pleadings and the file in this matter, the Court is fully informed and grants leave to file an amended answer and strikes the summary judgment motion.

Generally, Rule 15 advises the Court that "leave shall be freely given when justice so requires." This policy is "to be applied with extreme liberality." *Owens v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc.*, 244 F.3d 708, 712 (9th Cir. 2001) (quoting *Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. Rose*, 893 F.2d 1074, 1079 (9th Cir. 1990)).

15

14

16 17

18

19

20

In Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178 (1962), the Supreme Court offered the following factors a district court should consider in deciding whether to grant leave to amend:

In the absence of any apparent or declared reason—such as undue delay, bad faith or dilatory motive on the part of the movant, repeated failure to cure deficiencies by amendments previously allowed, undue prejudice to the opposing party by virtue of allowance of the amendment, futility of amendment, etc.—the leave sought should, as the rules require, be "freely given."

Id. at 182. See also Allen v. City of Beverly Hills, 911 F.2d 367, 373 (9th Cir. 1990); Hurn v. Ret. Fund Trust of the Plumbing, Heating & Piping Indus. of S. Cal., 648 F.2d 1252, 1254 (9th Cir. 1981).

Here, Defendants sought leave to file an amended answer on October 31, 2014, before the Court's November 1, 2014 deadline to amend pleadings. This is Defendants first request to amend their answer, and the Court finds no reason to suspect undue delay, bad faith, or dilatory motive. Accordingly, the motion is granted.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 1. Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Amended Answer, ECF No. 27, is **GRANTED**. Defendants shall promptly file their Amended Answer.
- 2. The Court **STRIKES** the December 3, 2014 Motion Hearing, and all related deadlines, on Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment,

ECF No. 5. The Clerks' Office is directed to **TERMINATE** the motion flag on **ECF No. 5**.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The Clerk's Office is directed to enter this Order and provide copies to all counsel.

DATED this 5th day of November 2014.

SALVADOR MENLUZA, JR. United States District Judge